DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 349 644 EA 024 216

AUTHOR McLaughlin, H. James
TITLE Seeking Solidarity and Responsibility: The Classroom Contexts of Control and Negotiation.
PUB DATE Apr 92
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Communication; *Classroom Techniques; Conflict Resolution; Discipline; Elementary Secondary Education; *Power Structure; Sanctions; *Social Control; *Teacher Student Relationship

ABSTRACT

Teachers' attempts to establish and maintain authority in their classrooms give rise to one of the essential tensions of teaching: reconciling caring and controlling. This paper examines sociopolitical questions about the nature of classroom authority and the uses of power to understand this tension. The first part presents an overview of the social and historical contexts of control, drawing on the works of Foucault (1979), Apple (1990), and Popkewitz (1987). The second part offers a critique of the prevailing "management" metaphor of control insofar as it constructs educators' conceptions of classroom authority and fails to address the tensions of caring and controlling. Part 3 describes recent efforts to shift the focus from obedience to responsibility, in response to narrow interpretations of the management metaphor. The final part discusses how classrooms and schools might be conceived as sites of teacher-student negotiation. Because negotiation represents a form of caring, a focus on the negotiatory nature of schooling highlights the ever-present tensions of caring and controlling. The contexts, purposes, and realms of negotiation are described; in conclusion, acts of negotiation may enhance both individual responsibility and group solidarity. (Includes 44 references.) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED349644

SEEKING SOLIDARITY AND RESPONSIBILITY:
THE CLASSROOM CONTEXTS OF CONTROL AND NEGOTIATION

H. James McLaughlin
College of Education
University of Hawai'i
1776 University Ave.
Honolulu, HI 96822

Teachers' attempts to establish and maintain authority in their classrooms give rise to one of the essential tensions of teaching: reconciling caring and controlling (McLaughlin, 1991). In trying to understand this tension, one must confront socio-political questions about the nature of classroom authority and the uses of power. The intent of this paper is (1) to analyze the contexts, purposes and practices of maintaining teachers' authority, and (2) to consider how the practice of legitimate authority needs to incorporate an understanding of control and a dedication to negotiation as a means of creating social solidarity.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN **OTHER THAN PAPER COPY** HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

H. J. McLaughlin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 024 216

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SEEKING SOLIDARITY AND RESPONSIBILITY:
THE CLASSROOM CONTEXTS OF CONTROL AND NEGOTIATION

H. James McLaughlin
College of Education
University of Hawai'i
1776 University Ave.
Honolulu, HI 96822

Paper presented at annual meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
San Francisco, CA
April 21, 1992

INTRODUCTION

Teachers' attempts to establish and maintain authority in their classrooms give rise to one of the essential tensions of teaching: reconciling caring and controlling (McLaughlin, 1991). In trying to understand this tension, one must confront socio-political questions about the nature of classroom authority and the uses of power. The intent of this paper is (1) to analyze the contexts, purposes and practices of maintaining teachers' authority, and (2) to consider how the practice of legitimate authority needs to incorporate an understanding of control and a dedication to negotiation as a means of creating social solidarity.

The analysis occurs in four parts. First, I offer an overview of the social and historical contexts of control, utilizing the work of Foucault (1979), Apple (1990), and Popkewitz (1987). Subsequently I critique the prevailing "management" metaphor of control insofar as it constricts educators' conceptions of classroom authority and fails to address the tensions of caring and controlling. A third section describes recent efforts to shift the focus from obedience to responsibility, in response to narrow interpretations of the management metaphor.

Then in summary I discuss how we might conceive of classrooms and schools as sites of negotiation between teachers and students. Because

negotiation represents a form of caring, focusing on the negotiatory nature of schooling highlights the ever-present tensions of caring and controlling. I further describe the contexts, purposes and realms of negotiating, and finally assert that acts of negotiation may result in enhancing both individual responsibility and group solidarity. The paper begins with my construal of the meanings of authority, power and control.

THE MEANINGS OF AUTHORITY, POWER AND CONTROL

Authority is a grant to exercise power. Teachers assume the authority of being an adult and a person assigned to the position of "teacher." Teachers also know that students must confer authority on them if the teacher is to succeed in creating an environment conducive to learning, a classroom which is not simply a punitive cell. One's authority in social settings is not only assumed by reason of one's position and conferred by others in the setting.

Power, which is the exercise of authority, is not an entity or something to be possessed. The idea of power represents an ability to affect others and one's environment, which is enabled by certain resources (Giddens, 1979). Power is "contested and not invested" (Ball, 1987, p. 85). Teachers exercising power due to their authority are not completely autonomous, and they do not merely impose their desires on students if they desire legitimate authority. Relations of legitimate authority are negotiated through interactions with others in a setting. *Control* is one outgrowth of power: it represents the enacting of power in order to direct another person or to delimit the environment. Control is not the only end, however. I am attracted to Bowers and Flinders's notion that *solidarity* is another possible outcome of human interactions (Bowers & Flinders, 1989). Solidarity represents the fruits of caring. Acts of caring and controlling are intertwined and cannot be separated without misunderstanding how teachers and students interact. Such acts must be seen in light of classroom, school and societal contexts in order for their consequences to make sense.

As indicated by what I have just asserted, a teacher's <u>legitimate</u> authority has four characteristics: it derives from personal and positional relationships with students; it is both assumed and conferred; it is constrained or enabled by school and societal contexts; and it is predicated on the transformation of control by caring (McLaughlin, 1991).

There have been a multitude of approaches to establishing classroom authority. Curwin & Mendler (1988) have described two general "models" of discipline, the obedience model and the responsibility model (pp. 20-27). I think of them not as models, which conjures up a unified front that does not exist, but as "perspectives" that represent differing purposes and actions. The following sections of the paper will examine the obedience and responsibility perspectives. I will then explore the negotiatory aspects of classroom and school life, and how negotiation highlights solidarity and shared power. It is first necessary to outline the historical and political contexts of control, to provide a framework for the subsequent sections.

HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL UNDERPINNINGS OF CONTROL

For the following historical analysis of control, I have chosen to utilize three commentaries: Foucault's, on institutional control in society (1979), Apple's, on school control (1990), and Popkewitz's, on political contexts of schooling (1987).

At a macro-social level Foucault (1979) has outlined a genealogy of control, a history of how Westerners since the Reformation have understood control and the consequences of regimes of control. Foucault defined *discipline* as the utilization of power to directly control others and also as a body of privileged knowledge. Power produces legitimated knowledge; knowledge presumes power relations. This joining together of power and knowledge (Foucault termed it "power-knowledge") assumes in Foucault's analysis a forbidding shape, the perfectly square and penitential shape of the hospital ward, the prison cell, and the classroom, all rooms where surveillance is the means and unilateral control is the end.

In the *Ancien Regime* of Europe there was a kind of tolerated illegality, an ambiguity concerning who and how to punish. Control was primarily attained through public punishments which took the form of horrifying (and edifying) spectacles. During the Enlightenment legal limits were set with regard to the power of a sovereign to punish. Justice became less irregular and punishment less intense -- "but at the cost of greater intervention" (Foucault, 1979, p 75). Monarchical law was gradually replaced by a reformed judicial system in which individual motivations and habits were objectified. After 1810, detention and not physical deprivation or chastisement became the primary form of punishment. Though corporal punishment in schools has maintained some standing until today, schools have employed the same

disciplinary means as other societal institutions: the distribution of individuals and the control of activity. Modern forms of discipline distribute students by:

(1) "enclosing" them (in discrete, relatively autonomous classrooms);

(2) "partitioning" them so that individuals have their own place (separate desks), while sub-groups and "collective dispositions" are avoided;

(3) considering classrooms as "functional sites" where space is efficiently used according to the dictates of management guidelines and not educational principles (pp. 141-143).

The control of activities relies on "setting time tables" by breaking school time into uniform segments and on separating, comparing, and ranking students by score (p. 159). Disciplinary knowledge is dissected into small samples under the microscope lens of science; disciplinary power is enacted through "micro-penalties." Control in schools has resulted in a "perpetual penality" achieved by nearly constant surveillance of students. Students are to be closely observed, their attitudes analyzed, their movements monitored. In a compulsory, increasingly standardized school system the "offenses" of misbehavior include time (lateness, absence), activity (movement away from one's seat), behavior ("insubordination"), speech (offensive language), body (bad smells), and sexuality (suggestive clothing).

Schools have thus come to resemble "a machine for supervising, hierarchizing, rewarding" (p. 147). Students are deemed more or less "normal" according to some shadowy, taken-for-granted standard. At the same time that this normalization and totalization has been occurring, the self has been increasingly commodified by emphasizing "individualization" and "self-esteem."

Central to this view of control and punishment is the examination -- literally taken to mean testing and evaluation, though figuratively it connotes overseeing and monitoring students' every action in the classroom. It is something students must do and something that is done to them; they are examined. (Hoskins, 1990, has challenged Foucault's historical analysis at this point, claiming that examination as a form of control originated in the 12th century). Examination is an individual and a social discipline. It is the apotheosis of normalization and surveillance.

Foucault's analysis may be amplified by noting Apple's (1990) comments on how social and economic meanings are distributed through the "overt and hidden curricula in schools."

> It should be obvious, though it is not usually so, that questions about meanings in social institutions tend to become questions of control. That is, the forms of knowledge (both overt and covert kinds) one finds within school settings imply notions of power and of economic resources and control... [Early curriculum workers] not only assumed that organized society must maintain itself through the preservations of some of its valued forms of interaction and meaning (a quite general and wholly understandable 'weak' sense of social control). They also had, deeply embedded in their ideological perspective, a 'strong' sense of control (pp. 46-47).

Schools offered, in this "strong sense," a mechanism for social control to preserve existing privilege and to define what constituted legitimate knowledge and action in classrooms. In the late 18th and early 19th centuries, schools in the U.S.A. were "the guarantors of social order and stability" (p. 71). Organizational efficiency and a reliance on certain modes of scientific thinking, which are reflected in the idea of school and classroom management, were the means to ensure the control of common meanings in the curriculum. A century ago this emphasis on management and control was quite overt but control has become more "hidden" in organizational and physical structures or in teaching strategies, and is heard less often in the pronouncements of educational leaders.

Popkewitz (1987) advances the discussion by noting the tensions of individualism and social order as they were played out in the development of school subjects. On the one hand psychologists early in this century "emphasized individual ability and social development based upon merit... The assumption was that children grew universally in relation to a normative progression" (p. 17). Teachers were supposed to determine students' individual "needs" and then promote individual talents. "The individual is seen to exist as separate from a social world which contains inequities, differential power arrangements and competing conceptions of knowledge" (p. 21).

Yet there was a "strong" control over students' actions because of a continuing emphasis on moral socialization into the unified culture that

constituted America. In classrooms, moral authority was transmitted through discipline -- in light of Foucault's analysis, through "example and examination" (Jones, D., 1990). Discipline was enacted within the metaphor of "classroom management," a catch-all phrase that aimed to develop citizenship and individual responsibility. Let me now discuss the meanings of classroom management, from an obedience perspective and a responsibility perspective.

MEANINGS OF CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

In its most benign form (Brown, 1933; Sears, 1928), the classroom management of generations ago meant altering the environment to encourage learning, practicing democratic principles rather than relying on teacher autocracy, and balancing punishments with positive incentives. Alter the language along with the dated cultural references and Brown's open-ended, wide-ranging casebook of classroom management problems could be in print today. But alongside such accounts of the need for a democratic management there have always been denunciations of student misbehavior and concomitant calls for greater obedience.

The obedience perspective: Disciplinary power

All metaphors about teaching and learning are legitimated within philosophical systems and corresponding political stances, and they serve the interests of a particular group of people. Why has "classroom management" become the predominant metaphor for establishing relations of authority? At a societal level, I attempted in the previous section to explain how the modern management metaphor mirrors a centuries-old movement to enact discipline and gain control over the individual, even as the canonization of the individual has occurred. The term "management" accurately reflects a more recent preoccupation with scientific efficiency and bureaucratic political control. At the school level, an obedience perspective on classroom relationships serves the interests of those teachers and administrators who seldom question alternative interpretations of control, or consider the nature of negotiation and the need for solidarity.

Now, classroom management as an idea covers a lot of territory (Charles, 1989; Doyle, 1986; Duke & Meckel, 1984; and Emmer, Evertson, Sanford, Clements, & Worsham, 1989, offer extended explanations of approaches to classroom management). There is a broader definition that may entail organizing (keeping track of one's materials, establishing seating

charts, and maintaining an accurate and up-to-date grading system), planning (utilizing a variety of instructional techniques), knowing students, evaluating oneself, and maintaining a positive attitude (Reed, 1991, includes these parameters). But a significant segment of the education literature has described management in terms of overtly controlling students' behavior. One clear and salient definition of "behavior management," a narrower term that expresses an obedience perspective, was provided by Emmers & Evertson (1981):

> Effective classroom management consists of teacher behaviors that produce high levels of student involvement in classroom activities, minimal amounts of student behaviors that interfere with the teacher's or other students' work, and efficient use of instructional time (p. 342).

Notice how teachers are to concern themselves with the means of control. A major purpose of authority -- and the uses of power -- in this scheme is to maintain adult control over younger people. Obedience is paramount, as witnessed by an astonishing claim in the midst of a debate over the importance of student obedience:

> Without obedience and adult-formed structure, random forces will control student learning. This fosters inefficiency at best and, at worst, error... Simply put, there *is* no task without clear and explicit teacher control, no matter how the control is manifest, and there is no "time on task" unless there is student obedience to that control (Zern, 1991, p. 7).

In the preceding accounts, classroom management is a matter of <u>teacher behaviors</u> -- not student actions. The learning tasks and structures are fashioned independent of student actions or concerns, and students are supposed to learn only what the teacher proposes. It is the professional version of 18th century aristocratic *noblesse oblige:* teachers should not share power with students because that is what constitutes legitimate authority in teaching; rather, students may learn something of interest to them or may offer a few suggestions about class rules because teachers are big-hearted and it fits their plans.

The stated outcomes of behavior management are time-on-task and efficiency. And there is another not-so-hidden outcome: the normalization of students' actions. Emmers and Evertson (1981) approvingly cite Kounin's correlations of teacher "behaviors" with students' "work involvement" and "freedom from deviancy" (pp. 342-343). The curricular aims of education are taken for granted, and the not-so-hidden aims are to socialize students into "non-deviant" behavior, a slippery concept that is culturally and situationally determined.

Over the last decade "Assertive Discipline" has been the primary purveyor of the obedience perspective. Assertive Discipline places a strong emphasis on teachers taking charge, being strong. Debates over its merits have swirled through the pages of leading educational journals. Has research proven this discipline program effective? How should we account for the views of practitioners in assessing program effectiveness? What are the outcomes of such an approach? A recent exchange centered on such questions (McCormack, 1989; Render, et al., 1989). The major research or anecdotal evidence for effectiveness included whether teachers, students and administrators perceived it as effective; whether disciplinary referrals of students decreased; and whether "off-task behavior" abated. Should teacher or administrator satisfaction with a program provide the evidence of its effectiveness? Is that sort of outcome related to greater student learning of important knowledge, or simply to stronger control by someone in assumed authority? In such discussions there is usually a disconnection between classroom relationships and the curriculum or student learning.

There have been many criticisms of the obedience perspective on the grounds that it does not address the need for student input, it may exacerbate confrontations with students, it fails to teach students how to be responsible, it decreases teacher flexibility by pressuring teachers to publicly treat all students the same, and it is relatively ineffective anyway (Curwin & Mendler, 1988; Denscombe, 1985; Evans, Corsini & Gazda, 1990; Jones, V., 1991; Lickona, 1991). Proponents of Assertive Discipline have issued denials of the program's singular focus on obedience, and have asserted that the approach encourages students to be "self-managers" (Canter, 1989). But Assertive Discipline still embodies the supposition that self-control is born of unyielding obedience to adult domination, and that student responsibility is engendered by the teacher's rules and consequences. The obedience

perspective is flawed, but not because students should have the license to do whatever they wish in classrooms. There is no argument that some forms of social control are necessary for any classroom interaction to benefit the participants. The problem is that an obedience perspective incorporates a series of unexamined assumptions about the nature of power and control in classrooms and schools. The following passages characterize certain myths of teacher control in classrooms and probe the weaknesses of the obedience perspective in particular, as well as what is written about classroom management in general. I will speak first of assumptions about contexts and purposes, and will then depict assumptions about the practices of control.

Assumption about context:

Control is a classroom matter.

Foucault, Apple and Popkewitz painted with a broad brush the changing meanings of control from a societal standpoint. Denscombe (1985) has concentrated on the institutional contexts of control in schools. Because of prior experiences as students, the failure of teacher education to challenge assumptions, and socialization as new teachers, teachers perceive classroom control to be their prime duty (p. 53). In Denscombe's analysis, control is also deemed necessary because of schools' social and physical organization, particularly the influence of classroom autonomy and isolation. Three key factors affect teachers' understandings about classroom control:

* the knowledge that pupils are required to attend school and that teachers need a "capacity to establish and maintain classroom control" (see also Sarason, 1971);

* closed classrooms force teachers to operate as individuals and emphasize "the autonomy of the classroom teacher";

* because of dealing with "large groups of potentially recalcitrant pupils," and because of limited resources, teachers must depend on "personalized authority and personal commitments" more than institutional authority or bureaucratic rules and procedures (p. 10).

Though surveillance is a key teacher strategy for control of students, "what goes on in classrooms is more or less protected from direct surveillance, formal supervision and direction from colleagues and administrators" (p. 71). The secrecy and autonomy with regard to moment-by-moment decisions heightens the teacher's responsibility for what goes on in class. Rules and authority structures become less important than what is

negotiated between teachers and students. Control is thus socially constructed in classrooms, even as school and societal contexts exert powerful effects.

Assumption about purposes:

There exists a consensus about the aims of control, so we ought to concentrate on the means of control.

This assumed consensus is apparent in articles written by behavior management advocates. As I will point out shortly, the assumptions about aims are being challenged by those promoting education for self-responsibility and for solidarity.

Assumptions about practices:

Control is non-negotiated because power is assumed by one's position and not conferred by students.

In traditional behavioral versions of classroom management, students may help to establish rules at the start of a school year, but the ongoing enforcement of those rules often is not cast as a series of negotiations over the exercise of power in the classroom -- which I believe it is. Denscombe's (1985) analysis centered on the tensions between personal and positional authority. Let me explain further.

Control is uncertain because it is context specific and involves normalizing pressures from students and other teachers. There is an implicit demand for quiet, order, and stillness in classrooms. Denscombe posits that there are three kinds of teacher strategies which explicitly or implicitly aim to reduce teachers' reliance on personal charismatic authority and minimize uncertainty: domination, classwork management and co-optation. *Domination* strategies fit neatly within the obedience perspective, while the two other strategies assert control in less obtrusive ways. *Classwork management* relies on limited, teacher-led instructional strategies to maintain authority (such as recitation), and on group management strategies where the intention is to "keep 'em busy" and to utilize the threat of work or testing to control students' actions. *Co-optation* is achieved when students participate in sports, school committees and the like. "[T]he democratization tends to be illusory and is geared primarily to securing a certain commitment on the part of pupils to the existing social order" (p. 111). On a classroom level, teachers might use humor or a cultural identification with students to gain the students' personal commitment to class activities.

Control depends on teacher behaviors and on consequences and rewards determined by the teacher.

Glasser (1990) has articulately challenged this notion, noting that it reflects a retrograde behaviorism lingering in the schools. He talks of "boss-managers" who expect obedience and "lead-managers" who understand that real power is conferred by students when their basic needs are met.

Control is basically extra-curricular, and "classroom management" is differentiated from "instruction."

Denscombe's notions of "classwork management apply here. McNeil (1987) and others have shown the workings of curricular control through the narrowing of content and the limiting of questioning. There is no sense in divorcing how one establishes and nurtures classroom relationships from how one teaches; the former is part-and-parcel of the latter.

Problems that threaten control are thought to reside in the individual student, and so ought to be resolved through encounters with a student or family.

There is a grievous lack of attention paid to the social nature of how one defines a "problem." Problems occur when individuals interact in a certain arena, and thus they reside within situated social systems (Purkey & Strahan, 1986, pp. 25 & 29). The contexts that Denscombe (1985) and others have described let us see that problems are socially defined according to what is considered "normal" in a certain setting, and that the same actions could be labeled differently in another circumstance.

THE RESPONSIBILITY PERSPECTIVE: SELF-DISCIPLINARY POWER

The responsibility perspective, which is often perceived by its proponents as a form of classroom management, offers a challenge to the behavior management metaphor. Curwin & Mendler (1988) describe the responsibility perspective this way:

Its purpose is to teach students to take responsibility for their behavior. They can learn to be responsible if they are treated with dignity, if the teacher employs logical consequences, and if the teacher understands the relationship between good teaching and good discipline. The student learns that "I cause my own outcomes. I have more than one alternative behavior in any situation. I have the power to choose the best alternative" (p. 26). The authors are disdainful of a "packaged method" and supportive of a "caring classroom environment" (p. 31).

The promises and problems associated with the responsibility perspective can be seen in many similar summaries: Evans, Corsini & Gazda's "Individual Education" (1990); Glasser's "Control Theory" (1990); Kohn's "Caring Schools" (1991); Lickona's "Educating for Character" (1991); Purkey & Strahan's "Positive Discipline" (1986); and Schaps & Solomon's "Developmental Discipline" (1990). Seldom do the writings on responsibility address the complex contexts of schooling and classrooms (Lickona, 1991, pp. 323-347 and 395-420, presents an exception, although the author does not account for culture, gender or social class as contexts of control and socialization). Discussions of the history and politics of control are rarely broached.

The purpose of classroom management within this perspective is to promote individual behavioral and attitudinal change -- what could be labeled self-discipline. In terms of the practices that lead to responsibility, there is a rejection of overt coercion, with a de-emphasis on struggles over power and competition and a corresponding emphasis on individual choice-making and mutual respect (see examples in Curwin & Mendler, 1988, pp. 102-109). Lists of goals such as "responsibility, respect, resourcefulness, and responsiveness" (Evans, Corsini & Gazda, 1990) or "trust, intentionality, respect, and optimism" (Purkey & Strahan, 1986) are promoted. Rewards and consequences are demoted in favor of efforts to intrinsically motivate students. Whatever consequences are enforced should be "natural" and "logical" (with hats off to Dreikurs & Cassel, 1972).

In this perspective I applaud the emphasis on engendering students' self-discipline through teachers' caring acts. I also think that throughout this literature on responsibility there seems an uneasy peace between centering on responsibility for oneself (an emphasis that is quite pronounced in Evans, Corsini & Gazda, 1990), and focusing more on group processes and responsibility for others (especially Kohn, 1991; Schaps & Solomon, 1990; and the numerous practical examples in Lickona, 1991). This is because in many cases there are really <u>two</u> perspectives being discussed: responsibility and solidarity. The final section of the paper asserts that legitimate authority depends on establishing solidarity with students, and describes how this is enacted through classroom negotiations. That necessitates an understanding of the contexts, purposes, and practices of negotiation.

THE SOLIDARITY PERSPECTIVE: SHARED POWER

Tensions of establishing legitimate authority

To Denscombe (1985), caring was subsumed under "co-optation" or "classwork management," and Foucault (1979) left little space for caring to counteract the panoptic structures of control. For teachers today, issues of control are dealt with through numerous inservice programs within their districts purporting to show them how to be better classroom "managers," how to deal with discipline problems in a more efficient and positive manner. Issues of caring may be wholly ignored. So are teachers merely well-meaning but unwitting managers or wardens? I believe not.

Most teachers with whom I have taught and talked over the years wish to enact legitimate authority by encouraging varying levels of student participation. In doing so, they experience an important tension in teaching. *Tension* derives from the Latin "tendere," meaning "to stretch." Tension is the state of being stretched tight and made taut; or in another light, the balance maintained in an artistic work between opposing forces or elements (Webster's). Frequently, tension is interpreted in negative terms. The teacher may feel stretched to the point of breaking because of an inability to control events in the classroom, or to maintain a caring approach to students. Such tensions are certainly present, but I want also to examine the positive form of tension, as a balance between differing (though not always opposing) forces.

In this case, I believe there are two sorts of tensions teachers feel: one is between the desire to care for students and the hope to control the environment and students' actions, and the other is between a focus on individual interests/responsibilities and a focus on group interests/solidarity. *Solidarity* "involves the rapport established through social interaction or the feeling that the interaction is proceeding on the basis of some shared interest" (Bowers & Flinders, 1989, p. 141). Many teachers seek to legitimate their authority -- and thus their uses of power -- by balancing acts of caring and controlling, along with individual and group interests.

I want to assert that facing up to these tensions compels teachers to understand and utilize various forms of *negotiation*, which is one aspect of caring for students. Negotiation entails power sharing. It is built on a desire to determine shared interests, an ability to confer about decisions to be made and curricular ideas to be plumbed, and a willingness to face up to conflict and then effect compromise. Both teachers and students need to exercise

power for solidarity to be shaped. Solidarity is a fluid ideal that teachers and students are constantly seeking through daily re-negotiations in classrooms. If solidarity results from acts of caring -- constituted in part by the negotiations between teacher and students -- then there is always a tension about the relationship of caring and controlling. There are important questions to be asked about whose interests are shared in classrooms, and about how issues of gender, culture, and social class arise in these discussions. I will now pose a series of questions that educators must answer if we are to create alternative interpretations of control. The questions concern the contexts, purposes, realms and limits of negotiation.

Contexts of negotiation: What is the nature of control?

In order to truly negotiate with students, a teacher must think about the nature of control, in historical, political, and environmental terms. Contrary to the assumption of the obedience perspective, control is a classroom, school, and community issue that reflects institutional histories. An obedience perspective, and even the more individually-centered aspects of the responsibility perspective, reproduce societal structures in their uses of surveillance techniques, their distribution of students, and their control of activities. A re-examination of how we examine students (in the sense of testing and monitoring) will have to be undertaken. Teachers should consider whether to choose tables instead of individual desks, how they might group students for control, and how they limit the curriculum through the sorts of ideas and questions that are raised. How do the teacher's views of knowledge -- of what is worth knowing, and when students should come to know it -- serve to control students' learning? And to what extent do teachers define problems of control as individual or social?

I recognize that one's willingness to address such questions depends in part on altering another contextual aspect: the isolation of teachers. Denscombe (1985) and others, as I noted, have characterized institutional alienation. Teachers are on the one hand placed in separate classrooms, which might seem to augur well for experimentation with alternative forms of caring and controlling. But the "loose coupling" of schools, exemplified by student and teacher "grapevines" with their whispered criticisms, results in teachers' frequently establishing fiefdoms of control to maintain their images. Acute isolation and relative autonomy mask the structural and social controls of schools.

There is one more major issue of control I want to mention: the complex of language, culture and thought that Bowers and Flinders (1989) refer to as "an ecology of the classroom." This notion of student-teacher interactions:

> ... [B]rings forward an image of control that is far more complex than one which places its primary emphasis on the teacher's unilateral decision making about classroom rules of the use of behavioral reinforcement. An image of control based on unilateral decision making assumes that individuals can be understood as autonomous and that rational processes are culture-free... [But] the teacher's efforts to establish rules, or a "work system," both control *and* are controlled by cultural patterns of interaction (pp. 128-29).

The manner in which the teacher frames teaching, learning and schooling, through culturally and linguistically influenced ways of communicating with students, can be opened up to question. This is not to say that we can merrily erase our upbringing and the social messages we convey. But it is incumbent upon educators interested in claiming legitimate authority to examine how we enact control within a classroom "ecology."

Purposes of negotiation: Why do we negotiate?

Kohn (1991) argues that two of the approaches to changing students' behaviors and attitudes are "encouraging commitment to values" ("to help that child see himself or herself as the kind of person who is responsible and caring") and "encouraging the group's commitment to values" (to help the child internalize the value of community) (p. 501). Schaps & Solomon (1990) talk about how children are motivated by "belonging and contributing" (p. 39), and Glasser (1990) talks of children's needs for "power and belonging" (p. 54). Those comments and others signal the need for schools to balance individual responsibility and group solidarity. The purposes of negotiation should be to establish individual responsibility (self caring and self control) and solidarity (social caring and social control). Negotiation cannot work without an individual commitment which incorporates a sense of responsibility for oneself. Nor can negotiation work without a sense of social responsibility which enables shared interests to be sought and conflicts to be directly faced. Negotiatory acts are a form of power sharing which represents the teacher's commitment to democratic governance and an exploration of alternative forms of social control.

Realms of negotiation: What is negotiable? How do we negotiate?

Not everything in a classroom -- or a school -- is negotiable. On a schoolwide level, if one chooses to teach within a public school, such practices as grading, holding classes in scheduled 50-minute periods, responding to bells, doing fire drills and the like are nearly inescapable aspects of much institutional work. There are numerous ways in which teachers might agitate for broad institutional changes in addition to the common struggles over salary or working conditions. But the focus of this section lies on classroom interactions.

In the classroom a teacher can ignore students, encourage them, negotiate in one form or another, or try to directly control without negotiation. A common principle of classroom action is to ignore what appears to be peripheral and to control when a student is seriously disrupting the class. All else could be deemed negotiable. Often the realms of negotiation are perceived to encompass those times when students misbehave, when they reject one's "invitations" to participate in a positive manner (Purkey & Strahan, 1986, pp. 21-22). Another way to mark the boundaries is to conceive of "discipline" as "cooperative planning and problem solving" about matters of procedures, pedagogy and "housekeeping" (Kohl, 1991, p. 504). I argue that matters of discipline and control are curricular and extra-curricular, and that the possible realms of negotiation are vast. For the purposes of this paper I will now describe examples of how a teacher might negotiate in four classroom realms: setting rules and goals; developing curriculum; organizing the classroom activities; and assessing learning.

Setting rules and goals

Much has been written on how to develop rules and procedures collaboratively. Curwin & Mendler (1988) talk of a "social contract" in classrooms (pp. 47-64), Lickona (1991) details a "cooperative approach to rule-setting" (pp. 112-134), and Glasser (1990) holds that "lead-managers have minimal rules" which are derived through discussion (pp. 122-127). Sarason (1971) thinks of rule-setting as a matter of governance, one among many "constitutional issues" (pp. 175-178).

The aforementioned authors have proffered numerous fine ideas to engage students in the negotiation of rules. There are also efforts to negotiate when conflicts arise between students, or between student and teacher. In

Schaps and Solomon's "developmental discipline," the children "work collaboratively with the teacher to develop solutions to discipline problems" (1990 p. 39). Conflict resolution, a term referring to a range of formal negotiatory processes, is being enacted in scores of schools. Lickona (1991) gives examples of how teachers use "class meetings" to discuss classroom problems (pp. 143-147) and depicts several programs and information sources (286-299).

In addition to the teacher-directed approaches above, peer mediation has shown promise. The "Dispute Management in the Schools" project involved a cooperative venture between a university and school district (Araki & Takeshita, 1991). Researchers found that 95 percent of the disputes between students resulted in agreements that were still in effect a year later. "The project also revealed that all ethnic groups subscribe equally to the conflict management process, and that mediators need not be of the same ethnic group, sex, or position of influence as the disputants to be effective" (p. 36). Johnson and Johnson (1992), two prominent cooperative learning experts, are now examining the effects of peer mediation, so more information can be expected in the near future.

One more comment on this topic. Issues of gender, social status, and ethnic group should not be ignored during formal negotiations to resolve conflicts. Shook's descriptions of "ho'oponopono" (1985), a traditional Hawai'ian family problem-solving process, point to the cultural assumptions in mediation practices. There is more to be considered about the cultural and political assumptions of teacher- or peer-directed mediation.

In addition to rules and disputes, class goals can also be negotiated. Lickona (1991) speaks briefly of how some teachers have expanded students' roles in decision-making, which includes setting goals for the class. I would like to see much more thinking and practical action taken concerning the nature of teachers' and students' goals, and how the sometimes-conflicting goals might be negotiated.

Developing curriculum

Teacher and students can cooperatively determine the topics for an upcoming curriculum unit. Beane (1990) challenges the dominant subject-centered curriculum and proposes that an integrated curriculum would center on students' personal concerns and vital social issues. Though Beane does not describe the development process, in his scheme, unit themes would have to represent students' interests and some negotiatory process would need to be planned.

Curriculum is not a disembodied set of materials; it consists of the plans a teacher creates in advance and then continually re-creates in classroom interactions with students. A program called "Touchstones" is encouraging student leadership and participation in discussions by employing strategies to develop a group "where the students listen to and speak with one another, where every utterance is not mediated by the teacher" (Comber, Zeiderman & Maistrellis, 1989, p. 40). Discussions are instances when students can negotiate with a teacher about the substance and the direction of the curriculum. Altering the forms and purposes of teacher questioning serves to further negotiation, if we will see it in that light.

Organizing classroom activities

The physical organization and appearance of classrooms can be subjected to negotiatory questions. What part can students play in establishing and maintaining the environment? Too many classrooms have no area in which to read, to draw, to put up student work. How can they be in the classroom, through a recognition of their accomplishments and their interests?

Organization also refers to the grouping of students. Regular whole-group seating arrangements or shifting arrangements for class activities can be negotiated. Grant & Sleeter (1989) make a good point that teachers can allow students to group themselves and think it participatory, when in fact it simply reproduces the social groupings stratified by gender, social class, and ethnic group. Perhaps we should seat students according to our notions of breaking down socially-sanctioned group stratifications. The widespread use of cooperative learning has been accompanied by an emphasis on controlled heterogeneous grouping to assure gender and ethnic balance in groups. Here is where control and caring collide: is it more caring for a teacher to control the grouping of students, or to allow students to group themselves?

There is another aspect of cooperative learning that relates to negotiation. When students collaborate, they negotiate with each other in both obvious and subtle ways to determine leadership and to shape the outcomes of the activity. Why not include as part of the class's curriculum a clear focus on how groupwork operates as a form of negotiation, and then engage students in activities to learn how to negotiate with each other? This would constitute a kind of conflict resolution on an everyday basis. During small group work the teacher also negotiates with students regarding such matters as the goals of the group, the time limits of the activity, or the level of sound that is "allowable" before students are disturbed. These can be defined as teachers' unilateral decisions, or as matters that must be gauged by taking into account students' judgments.

Denscombe (1985) notes that teaching strategies which rely on the teacher being the focal point of the class make all decisions public, and place pressure on the teacher to treat all students the same, as a sign of "fairness." But groupwork allows teachers to "adjust their reactions to the particular circumstances of the group or the individual" (p. 109). The criteria of fairness become contextualized and differentiated, and the teacher can make less pressured decisions.

Examining students

It is important to check the forms of examination -- monitoring and testing students -- to ascertain what might be negotiable. There has been a great emphasis in the last twenty years on "with-it-ness" and other phrases that connote constant monitoring of students' actions. This monitoring has the double-edged purpose of looking out for students who might need help, while noticing students who are misbehaving. Again, there is a tension between caring and controlling. The teacher is in any case negotiating with each student he/she encounters, in terms of how much time is needed to confer, how much conferring the student actually wants, and how the student ought to proceed. I will offer no quick words of wisdom, except to note that we should view monitoring as a form of examination that merits self-questioning: "Am I 'hovering' over students too much, and not giving them enough chance to work without me? What are my purposes for monitoring, and how much time am I attending to possibly poor behavior compared with the time spent on curricular conversation?"

Examination as a form of assessment also needs to be problematized. Standardized tests and other non-interactive examinations are non-negotiatory. There is a place for pre-written, rigidly scored tests that are taken individually. Teachers should make a place in their schedules as well for more conferences and oral examinations with students. Conferences are really an informal conversation about the curriculum, while oral examinations are more formal. In either case they are more negotiatory than a paper-and-pencil test. Students have the opportunity to "talk back" by asking questions, by clarifying an initially poor response, by thinking for a moment. And conferences or oral examinations can be done in small groups (pairs or threes seem best), which allows students to confer with and respond to one another.

The idea of negotiation might seem antithetical to grading. After all, aren't grades meant to represent an objective means of judging how students have achieved, in relation to certain criteria or to other students? How can one negotiate a grade? It all smacks of students playing up to the teacher or of the teacher playing favorites. But there are many means of negotiating grades. There is, of course, a contract, in which the student agrees to fulfill certain requirements in exchange for a particular grade. This and other examples of individualized evaluation may be successful, depending in part on whether they are based on controlling (a contract only for behaving well in class) or on broader caring acts (a contract stipulating the grounds for academic success). In many cases, teachers negotiate contracts with the student, asking for the student's judgments about what he/she should do to succeed.

The final aspect of examination I will address is the current fascination with "authentic assessment." Regardless of its worth as an accurate indicator of student progress, an assessment strategy such as portfolio development can profit from a negotiatory stance. Why shouldn't students negotiate with a teacher concerning what belongs in a portfolio, since the portfolio is intended to include representative work? How might such negotiations ensue, and how can the teacher incorporate both the student's and teacher's perspectives on the quality of the work?

The limits and risks of negotiating

Teachers do not negotiate everything. There are times when disciplinary power is enacted by the teacher in order to unilaterally establish organization or order. The earlier discussion of who should compose classroom seating indicated a rationale for limiting negotiation in that instance. There are numerous other situations where legitimate authority does not rule out unilateral, non-negotiated social control. Bowers (1987) warns us not to conceptualize emancipation as "the progressive stripping away of external forms of authority, responsibility, and embeddedness" (p. 77). One central question to ask oneself is "When will I not negotiate? Why not?"

Negotiation involves several sorts of risks. Teachers who make their actions in any way accountable to students may risk maintaining control (Denscombe, 1985, p. 108). This is where "Don't smile until Christmas," "Start out tough and then you can always lighten up later," and other hackneyed phrases enter the picture. These axioms are intended to scare new teachers away from any idealistic notions of negotiating with students. Democracy will be discussed and not displayed. And the axiom-wielders are right, in one sense. If a teacher has no carefully considered plan for how to respond to students' interests, no serious scheme concerning when to ignore, encourage, negotiate or unilaterally control, then problems will multiply. Students have been socialized into restricted images of teachers, and they often rebel when asked to remake the images. If, however, a teacher has thought deeply about control and caring and has developed plans to establish legitimate authority, then fewer conflicts may occur and greater solidarity will be built.

A second risk of negotiation is co-optation. Swidler (from Denscombe, 1985) described three alternative forms of social control at two "free schools." "Internalization" occurred when students "embrace[d] the ethos of self-directed learning" and identified with the school and staff. "Group control" meant that teachers promoted group solidarity to keep students attuned to class goals. "Personal influence and charisma" resulted when "personal allegiance and loyalty" formed the basis for control. Notice the negative cast on solidarity, which seemed to reflect a manipulative use of solidarity to maintain control. It is all too easy to settle for co-optation instead of negotiation. I concur that relying on personal charismatic authority leads quite rapidly into the quicksands of conflict. But it is ultimately cynical to

equate acts meant to construct solidarity with acts that serve only the teacher's ends.

CONCLUSION

The tensions of caring and controlling, of individual responsibility and group solidarity, will be always with us. I agree with Foucault (1979) that control has become less dramatic and more intrusive in people's lives, and with Popkewitz (1987) that schools represent in many ways a reproduction of an inequitable social order.

I also find it useful to think about Dewey's conceptions of discipline and control. In Dewey's thinking (1916), *discipline* referred to the mastery of the resources and capabilities that constitute power. The term concentrated on the individual, so that one was seen as responsible when one was growing toward ever-greater forms of self-discipline, toward honing one's capabilities. This positive connotation of discipline contrasts with that of Foucault, who portrayed discipline as something imposed on persons, as a constraint. When Dewey spoke of constraints he used the term *social control*, and he tried to give that phrase a positive turn also. For him, the purpose of social control should be growth: "not the negative quality of the possibility of immaturity," but "a positive force or ability -- the power to grow" (Dewey, 1916, p. 42). That sort of power to grow had to be developed through group interactions, in which students were allowed certain democratic freedoms but not the license to disrupt or harm others.

So I listen to the voices of Foucault and others who have explored the sometimes subterranean structures of institutional and political control, alongside the voices of educational theorists such as Dewey who have searched for the nurturing meanings of discipline and control. Educators should be obliged to determine what constitutes legitimate authority and to carefully analyze different uses of power to establish control. We can only do that by examining the contexts within which authority is legitimated or resisted, the purposes of a particular approach to authority and control, the realms of negotiation, and the means of negotiating.

Even given the strength of institutional and cultural patterns, we cannot deny that collective acts of caring make a difference. In these incredibly individualistic times we are compelled to call for negotiatory acts of caring that might lead to greater solidarity and a more acute sense of social responsibility.

References

Apple, M.W. (1990). Ideology and curriculum. New York, NY: Routledge.

Araki, C.T. & Takeshita, C. (1991). Students helping students: Dispute management in the schools. NASSP Bulletin, November, 31-37.

Berman, S. (1990). Educating for social responsibility. Educational Leadership, 48(3), 75-80.

Bowers, C.A. (1987). Elements of a post-liberal theory of education. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Bowers, C.A. & Flinders, D.J. (1990). Responsive teaching. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Brown, E.J. (1933). Everyday problems in classroom management. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Canter, L. (1989). Assertive Discipline -- More than names on the board and marbles in a jar. Phi Delta Kappan, September, 57-61.

Charles, C.M. (1989). Building classroom discipline. New York, NY: Longman.

Clifford, M.W. (1990). Students need challenge, not easy success. Educational Leadership, 48(1), 22-26.

Comber, G., Zeiderman, H. & Maistrellis, N. (1989). The Touchstones Project: Discussion classes for students of all abilities. Educational Leadership, March, 39-42.

Curwin, R.L. & Mendler, A.N. (1988). Discipline with dignity. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Curwin, R.L. & Mendler, A.N. (1989). We repeat, let the buyer beware: A response to Canter. Educational Leadership, 46(46), 83.

Denscombe, M. (1985). Classroom control. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and education. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Doyle, W. (1986). Classroom organization and management. In M.C. Wittrock, Handbook of research on teaching (3rd edition). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Dreikurs, R. & Cassel, P. (1972). Discipline without tears: What to do with children who misbehave. New York, NY: Hawthorne.

Duke, D.L. & Meckel, A.M. (1984). Teacher's guide to classroom management. New York, NY: Random House.

Emmer, E.T., Evertson, C.M., Sanford, J.P., Clements, B.S., & Worsham, M.E. (1989). Classroom management for secondary teachers. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Emmer, E.T. & Evertson, C.M. (1981). Synthesis of research on classroom management. Educational Leadership, 342-347.

Ericson, D.P. & Ellett, F.S., Jr. (1990). Taking student responsibility seriously. Educational Researcher, 19(9), 3-10.

Evans, T.D., Corsini, R.J., & Gazda, G.M. (1990). Individual education and the 4Rs. Educational Leadership, 48(1), 52-56.

Foucault, M. (1979). Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison. New York, NY: Vintage.

Giddens, A. (1979). Central problems in social theory. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Glasser, W. (1990). The quality school. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Grant, G. & Sleeter, C. (1989). After the school bell rings. London: Falmer.

Hooper, M. & Miller, S.D. (1991). The motivational responses of high, average, and low achievers to simple and complex language arts assignments: Classroom implications. Research in Middle Level Education, 15(1), 105-119.

Hoskin, K. (1990). Foucault under examination: The crypto-educationalist unmasked. In Ball, S.J. (Ed.), Foucault and education, pp. 29-53. New York, NY: Routledge.

Jones, D. (1990). The genealogy of the urban schoolteacher. In Ball, S.J. (Ed.), Foucault and education, pp. 57-77. New York, NY: Routledge.

Jones, V. (1991). Resolved: That researchers and intellectuals grossly undervalue the importance of simple student obedience in the classroom (*Con*). Curriculum Review, 31(3), 6, 9-11, 12.

Kohn, A. (1991). Caring kids: The role of the schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(7), 496-506.

Lickona, T. (1991). Educating for character. New York, NY: Bantam.

McCormack, S. (1989). Response to Render, Padilla, and Krank: But practitioners say it works! Educational Leadership, 46(6), 77-79.

McLaughlin, H.J. (1991). Reconciling care and control: Authority in classroom relationships. Journal of Teacher Education, 42(3), 182-195.

McNeil, L.M. (1988). Contradictions of control. New York, NY: Routledge.

Popkewitz, T.S. (1987). The formation of school subjects and the political contexts of schooling. In Popkewitz, T.S. (Ed.) The formation of the school subjects pp. 1-24. London: Falmer.

Purkey, W.W. & Strahan, D.B. (1986). Positive discipline: A pocketful of ideas. Columbus, OH: National Middle School Association.

Reed, D.F. (1991). Effective classroom managers in the middle school. Middle School Journal, 23(1), 16-21.

Render, G.F., Padilla, J.M., & Krank, H.M. (1989). What research really shows about Assertive Discipline. Educational Leadership, 46(6), 72-75.

Sarason, S.B. (1971). The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Schaps, E. & Solomon, D. (1990). Schools and classrooms as caring communities. Educational Leadership, 48(3), 38-42.

Schockley, R. & Sevier, L. (1991). Behavior management in the classroom: Guidelines for maintaining control. Schools in the Middle, 1(2), 14-18.

Sears, J.B. (1928). Classroom organization and control. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Shook, E.V. (1985). Ho'oponopono: Contemporary uses of a Hawai'ian problem-solving process. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.

Zern, D. (1991). Resolved: That researchers and intellectuals grossly undervalue the importance of simple student obedience in the classroom (*Pro*). Curriculum Review, 31(3), 6-9, 11-12.